

REMARKS


In the Office Action, the claims were grouped as follows: Group I, claims 1-22, 25-43, 46, 47 and 55 to an assay method; Group II, claims 23-24, 44-45 and 48-54, said to be to a polynucleotide sensing solution and kit. Restriction was made between the inventions.

A requirement for species election was also made for the following claim features: the multichromophore of claims 2-8; the (signaling) chromophore of claims 12-17; and whether or not the method was performed on a substrate.

Applicants elect Group I, claims 1-22, 25-43, 46, 47 and 55, and reserve the right to amend their process claims to depend on this group. Applicants submit the species election is unclear in reciting subgeneric and species claims together. Applicants elect the multichromophore species "conjugated polymer" of claims 2 and 6; to the extent a further election may be required, Applicants elect the polymer of claim 7. Applicants elect the signaling chromophore species "fluorescent dye" of claims 13 and 15; to the extent a further election may be required, Applicants elect "fluorescein" as recited in claim 16. Applicants elect the method as not performed on a substrate. Claims reading on the elected species are asserted to be at least claims 1-2, 6-13, 15-16, 18-22, 25-26, 28 and 38-43.

In this response, claims 23-24, 44-45 and 48-54 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 2, 11 and 40 have been amended, all without prejudice. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the application as filed, including in the original claims, in examples 4-6, and in the following sections: "The Sensor Polynucleotide" beginning at page 19 line 17; "The Signaling Chromophore" beginning at page 20 line 1, especially the paragraphs at page 21 line 4 and page 22 line 19; and "Excitation and Detection of Chromophores" beginning at page 25 line 22.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David W. Maher, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 40,077